Between mayoral elections, he was passionate in his leadership of the statewide committee that set up the Louisiana Health Care Authority to run the Charity hospital system and became chairman of the authority's board.

The activities bespeak involvement and dynamism, but they don't describe Donald Mintz's spirit. With his wife, Susan, he exuded a love of people, a love of life, a love of community, a devotion to New Orleans. Coupled with this tireless drive, the result is that he made a difference in his hometown.●

GAMBLING IN THE SUNLIGHT

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the New York Times has again hit the mark in a recent editorial supporting a national study of the economic and social impacts of gambling. The Gambling Impact Study Commission Act has received considerable attention as it makes its way through the committee process. Although the road has at times been bumpy, we are well on the way to creating a commission with the powers it needs to produce a balanced and fair analysis of legalized gambling.

In response to constructive criticism of the original bill, we have been hard at work crafting a substitute. Developed with bipartisan support, the substitute will take into account the legitimate interests of those whose livelihoods are invested in the industry as well as the concerns of those who would prefer to limit the expansion of gambling.

However, we are quickly running out of time. The American public deserves to know the advantages and disadvantages of legalized gambling. The Commission's report will be an important national resource for policymakers at all levels of government. In order to make this happen, we need to move quickly to make room on the Senate calendar and to insure the passage of the Gambling Impact Study Commission Act.

I urge my colleagues to read the editorial and to work with me to pass this act before it is too late.

I ask that the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 27, 1996]

GAMBLING IN THE SUNLIGHT

Just a few weeks ago, Representative Frank Wolf's proposal to create a commission on the social and economic impact of the nation's gambling explosion seemed just the sort of virtuous idea that everyone in this partisan Congress could support. In early March the House approved the nine-member study panel without dissent. But the Virginia Republican's proposal is in trouble in the Senate and may die there unless the majority leader, Bob Dole, exerts leadership to rescue it.

A special interest group known for its generous campaign contributions—the Nevada-based gaming industry—has teamed up with prominent and well-compensated Republican lobbyists to try to stop the bill. With help from Nevada's Democratic Senator, Richard Bryan, and Alaska's Ted Stevens, the Republican chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee, the effort seems to be succeeding.

Mr. Bryan blocked Senate action. Mr. Stevens, meanwhile, has produced a weak revision that would deny the commission the powers it needs to subpoena documents, convene investigative hearings and make recommendations that go beyond such obvious issues as native-American casinos and gambling on the Internet. Angered by criticism, Mr. Stevens last week decided, for now, against reporting any bill out of his committee. The delay increases the chance that the commission will die in the usual close-of-session legislative logjam.

The social and economic consequences of the rapid proliferation of casinos and state-run lotteries have received too little attention. There is room for a comprehensive look at the true costs and benefits for local economies and at the relationship between gambling and crime. There is also a need to look at the industry's role in creating gambling addicts and the extent to which earnings derive from problem gamblers. Even staunch supporters of legalized gambling cannot object to a fair effort to give localities the information they need to make informed decisions before turning to gambling as a source of new or increased revenue.

Although Mr. Dole has received hefty campaign contributions from the gambling industry, he has indicated his support for a national gambling study. To make it happen, though, he needs to move quickly to make room for the bill on the Senate calendar and to insure its passage with the commission's full investigative powers intact. Among other things the commission would study the gambling industry's ability to influence public policy. The Senate's timidity is a case in point.●

A RECIPE FOR GROWTH

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to my colleagues' attention a recent article by Felix Rohatyn titled "Recipe for Growth," which appeared in the April 11, 1996, Wall Street Journal.

Although he is a traditional Democrat, Flex Rohatyn has long advocated economic solutions and ideas that transcend political affiliation. And in a time when economic change and rising job insecurity are causing more and more American families to find that the promise of the American dream is increasingly unattainable his views deserve particular recognition.

Throughout my State of Connecticut, and the Nation as a whole, thousands of families are sitting around the kitchen table wondering how are they going to pay their monthly bills. How are they going to make their mortgage payments?

But the issue runs even deeper—to people's vision of the future. Will they have the money to send their kids to college? What happens if they lose their health care? How can they prepare for retirement when they barely have enough right now? These painful choices are leaving workers anxious and scared for the future.

Let me be clear on one point: There are millions of Americans who are succeeding in this economy. Since this administration took Office, the American economy has seen the creation of 8.5 million new jobs, many of which are both full time and at an increased wage.

However, while a significant number of Americans are succeeding, this rising tide is not lifting all boats. Many Americans are still suffering, and we must do more to deal with their plight.

Surely, there are no easy solutions to America's problems. We need to have a debate on these issues. But, most important, we need to start finding ways to increase economic growth be it through balancing our budget, reforming our tax laws to create new jobs, relieving business of the burdens of wasteful regulation or lowering interest rates.

I share the view of many responsible members of the business community who believe that our current growth rate of 2.5 per cent is far below the Nation's true capacity for growth. Our economy is capable of enhanced growth, and we must do more to realize this goal.

The benefits of economic growth are clear: An increase of as little as one-half of 1 percent in the growth rate, would wipe out the deficit, provide millions of dollars for tax cuts and create enormous employment opportunities for millions of American workers. Additionally, increasing economic growth would allow us to balance the budget without the draconian cuts in education, the environment, Medicare, Medicaid, and other social programs that my colleagues across the aisle have advocated.

Expanding economic growth may be the most important issue that faces our country and it is a challenge we all must undertake. Americans understand that when we all work together, from the public and private sectors to employers and employees we can face any challenge.

Felix Rohatyn's "Recipe For Growth" serves as an excellent blueprint for bringing genuine and real growth to the American economy. If we are serious about expanding growth and bringing the promise of the American dream to all our people, then I believe every Member of this body should take the time to read this article and heed the advice of Felix Rohatyn.

I ask that Mr. Rohatyn's article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 11, 1996]

RECIPE FOR GROWTH

(By Felix G. Rohatyn)

The American economy is now constrained by a financial iron triangle, in part created by the Republican majority together with the Clinton administration, from which it is difficult to break out and which is beginning to generate serious social tensions.

The first leg of this triangle is the commitment to balance the budget in seven years. Even though there has never been a rational explanation for this time frame, it has now become part of the political theology. It would be as dangerous for either party to depart from it, say by suggesting that eight or nine years would be equally logical, as it was for George Bush to abandon his "No new taxes" pledge.

The second leg is an extension of the first and is more restrictive in its effect: It is the acceptance, by both parties and blessed by the Congressional Budget Office, that our economic growth rate will be 2.2% for the seven-year period. Even though projections are notoriously inaccurate even over much shorter periods, this particular projection is becoming both a prediction and a self-limitation. It implies that this rate of growth is the limit of what our economy is capable of without inflation. Since this view has the support of the Federal Reserve, the Treasury and the financial markets, it has become a de facto limit on economic growth. The markets and the Fed react to any appearance of acceleration with higher interest rates and the economy then falls back to 2.2% or below.

The third leg of this triangle is the impact of technology and global competition on incomes and employment. THe lethal political combination of corporation downsizing together with ever-increasing differentials in wealth and income among Americans of differing levels of education and skills, and the huge rewards to capital as the result of the boom in the securities markets, are creating serious social tensions and political pressures.

Unless we can somehow break out of this iron triangle, we could face serious difficulties, and the best hope for a breakout is to make a determined effort for a higher rate of economic growth. Only higher growth, as a result of higher investment and greater productivity, can make these processes socially tolerable. In order to deal constructively with the realities of technology and the global economy. Democrats and Republicans may have to abandon cherished traditional positions and turn their thinking upside down: Democrats may have to redefine their concept of fairness, while Republicans may have to rethink the role of Government.

ECONOMIC INSECURITY

The American economy is growing very slowly despite occasional upward blips. Growth and inflation are both around 2%. Our main trading partners, Europe and Japan, are undergoing serious economic strains of their own, with German unemployment nearing 10% and French unemployment near 12%. Fiscal contraction is taking place on both sides of the ocean as the Maastricht criteria are maintained in Europe and deficit reduction continues as a priority here, feeding a general sense of economic insecurity. The winds of deflation could be stronger than the winds of inflation.

At the same time, the Dow Jones Industrial Average is near its all-time high of 5700, mergers and restructurings are still taking place at a record pace, and layoffs and downsizing are continuing as the inevitable result of global competition and technological change. And Pat Buchanan has created a political groundswell, on the left as well as on the right, by identifying real problems but proposing solutions based on fear, xenophobia, isolationism and protectionism. It is frightening to think of the political impact of a Buchanan if unemployment were now 7.5 percent instead of 5.5 percent. All that it requires is the next recession.

The social and economic problems we face today are varied. They include job insecurity, enormous income differentials significant pressures on average incomes, urban quality-of-life and many others. Even though all of these require different approaches, the single most important requirement to deal with all of them is the wealth and revenues generated by a higher rate of economic growth. John Kennedy was right: A rising tide lifts all boats. Although it may not lift all of them at the same time and at the same rate, without more growth we are simply redistributing the same pie. That is a zero sum game and it is simply not good enough.

The fact that our 2 percent-2.5 percent present growth rate is inadequate is proven by the very problems we face. The question of when, and especially how, to balance the federal budget deserves a great deal more intelligent discussion than the political sloganeering we have heard so far. The budget is a document that reflects neither economic reality nor valid accounting practices. If the budget is to be balanced in order to satisfy the financial markets, only real justification of this goal, then it must be done with growth rather than with retrenchment. That higher growth, together with controlling costs of entitlement like Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, will generate the capital needed to provide both private and public investment adequate to the country's needs.

Bringing the rate of growth from its present 2 percent-2.5 percent to a level of 3 percent-3.5 percent would generate as much as an additional $1 trillion over the next decade. It could provide both for significant tax cuts for the private sector as well as for the higher level of public investment in infrastructure and education required as we move into the 21st Century. It would obviously generate millions of new jobs. The present bipartisan commitment to balance the budget in seven years, based on the present anemic growth, is economically unrealistic and probably socially unsustainable. In all likelihood, higher growth is in fact the only way to achieve budget balance. The question is how to achieve it.

The conventional wisdom among most academic economists as well as the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board and Wall Street is that our economy cannot generate higher growth without running the risk of triggering inflation. Now everyone shares that view. In particular, the leaders of many of this country leading industrial corporations believe that we could sustain significantly higher growth rates based on the very significant productivity improvements they are generating in their own businesses, year-after-year.

Economics is not an exact science as we have painfully learned over and over again. It is the product of the psychology of millions of consumers, of business leaders making long term investment decisions, of capital flows instantaneously triggered by events and ideas. We must do away with the false notion that we must choose between growth or inflation. Our experience, even in the more recent past, shows that technology and competition can produce growth without serious inflationary pressures. In the face of today's totally new environment of almost daily revolutions in technology combined with globalization, we should be willing to be bolder, both in fiscal and monetary policy.

As a traditional Democrat, I have always believed that freedom, fairness and wealth, basic to a modern democracy, required an essentially redistributionist philosophy of wealth, that a fairly steeply graduated income tax was required as a matter of fairness and that lower deficits would guarantee adequate growth and a fair distribution of wealth. The experience of the last two decades, with the advent of the global economy, has very much shaken that view.

Fairness does not require the redistribution of wealth; it requires the creation of wealth, geared to an economy that can provide employment for everyone willing and able to work, and the opportunity for a consistently higher standard-of-living for those employed. Only strong private sector growth, driven by higher levels of investment and superior public services, can hope to providing the job opportunities required to deal with technological change and globalization. Only higher growth will allow that process to take place within the farmework of a market economy and a functioning democracy.

We should have no illusions about the likelihood of reducing the level of present income and wealth differentials; they are likely to increase in the near future as the requirements for skills and education increase. The world is not fair; we must, however, make it better for those in the middle as well as at the lower end of the economic scale. The key is enough growth that, even if initially the lower end does not gain as rapidly as the upper, it can improve its absolute standard of living, and being a process of closing the gap.

Higher growth requires a tax system that promotes growth as its main objective. It must encourage higher investment and savings. That is not the case today. Today's tax system aims at a concept of fairness dictated by distribution tables. That may not be the best test. A tax system with growth as its main objective may be a variation of the flat tax; or it may be a national sales tax; or it may be another system aimed at taxing consumption instead of investment such as proposed by Sens. Sam Nunn and Pete Domenici.

The power and dominance of global capital markets in today's world would seem to aim in the latter direction. Lowering taxes on capital would at first blush seem to help the already wealthy, current holders of capital. But whatever its effect on the distribution tables, it could unleash powerful capital flows, both domestic and foreign, that would lower interest rates significantly and make investment in the U.S. even more competitive than it is today. At the same time, they would maintain the strength of the dollar and maintain low rates of inflation.

Achieving the objective of higher growth could also include the gradual privatization of Social Security in order to create a massive investment pool with higher returns for the beneficiaries and greater investment capabilities for the private and the public sector. The key to economic success in the 21st Century will be cheap and ample capital, high levels of private investment to increase productivity, high levels of education and advanced technology. It also includes higher levels of public investment in building a national infrastructure supportive of the 21st century economy.

If the Democrats can redefine their concept of fairness, Republicans, on the other hand, may have to abandon their view of passive government. If growth and opportunity are to be the prime objectives of our society, the government must play an active role in some areas. The first is education; the second is higher levels of infrastructure investment; the third is in the maintenance of a corporate safety net.

Public school reform, driven by higher standards, is an absolute priority. Even though that is a state responsibility, it is a national problem. These standards, regardless of today's political conventional wisdom, will ultimately be national in scope. Access to higher education should be made available to any graduating high school senior meeting stringent national test levels and demonstrably in need of financial assistance. The equivalent of the GI Bill, providing national college scholarships to needy students, should be created and federally funded. It should be the primary affirmative action program funded by the federal government.

As part of a higher economic growth rate, state and local governments should provide higher levels of infrastructure investment. In addition to the creation of private employment, this could also provide public sector jobs to help meet the work requirements of welfare reform, as well as to provide the support to a high capacity modern economy. Financial assistance from the federal government would encourage the states in that endeavor. Higher growth would enable federal as well as state and local budgets to take on this responsibility.

A corporate safety net should be provided in order to deal with the inevitable dislocations which corporate downsizings and restructurings will continue to create. Business, labor and government should cooperate to create a system of portable pensions and portable health care to cushion the transition from one job to another. Incentives should be provided for business to make use of stock grants for employees laid off as a result of mergers and restructuring. If losing one's job creates wealth for the shareholders, the person losing his or her job should share in some of that wealth creation. Corporate pension funds, to the extent they are overfunded as a result of the stock market boom, could be part of a process to provide larger severance and retraining payments for laid-off employees.

Other than in areas such as pensions and health care, it is counterproductive to try to legislate the social side of ''corporate responsibility''; it is almost impossible to define. To begin with, most large U.S. corporations are majority-owned by financial institutions including the pension funds of the very employees who are in danger of displacements. These institutions, driven by their own competitive requirements, were the source of the pressures on management which resulted in the dramatic restructuring of American industry over the last decade. Those restructurings have made American industry highly competitive in world markets; they must continue and we must continue the opening of world trade.

Boards of directors are not blind to the risks of political backlash. The issue of executive compensation, made starkly visible by its tie-in with the rise in stock market values, will be dealt with responsibly or boards will find themselves under great shareholder pressure. The use of profit-sharing, stock options and stock grants to practically all levels of the corporation will be significantly expanded and should create greater common interests between executives, shareholders and employees. However, the main role of the corporation must remain to be competitive, to grow, to invest, to hire and to generate profits for its shareholders; a significant portion of employee compensation should be related to the growing productivity of its employees.

The benefits to business in such an approach are obvious, but labor also has a large stake in such a re-examination. Some of the proposals put forth at present would have very negative results for working Americans. It is too late to return to a protected American economy; the only result would be to trigger a financial crisis that would harm America and our trading partners. It is impossible to stop the effect of global information, technology, capital and labor. What is important for working people, union or non-union, is the creation of more well-paying jobs as a result of high levels of investment and high levels of education; to share in the profits of their employers through profit-sharing and stock ownership; to share in the benefit potential of pension funds vastly increased by the boom in the financial markets; to have access to permanent health care security and to high levels of education and training to deal with the 21st century requirements.

Business and labor, together, should hammer out such an agenda. If we are serious about balancing the budget in a responsible manner, the president and the congressional leadership could set a national objective that the economy's rate of growth reach a minimum sustainable level of 3% annually by the year 2000. They could ask the best minds in the country, from government, from business, from labor and from academia to provide a set of options which could lead to such a result. Many of these options would be politically difficult, both for Democrats and for Republicans, and some would probably be impossible. But the only way to abandon long-held notions that may no longer apply to today's world is to discuss them within the framework of a very simple and definite objective: higher growth.

A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE

Setting the U.S. on a path to higher growth will require coordination with our partners in the G–7. The Europeans should welcome such an initiative since they are in greater need for growth than we are. Nevertheless, the process will be slow and it must be put into motion.

The President's setting an objective of higher growth would have an important psychological impact; the economy is, after all, heavily influenced by psychological factors. If the president were to set an ambitious growth objective, then all elements affecting the economy would be subject to review from a different perspective. They would include fiscal and monetary policy; investments and savings; education and training; and international trade. Most importantly, these activities should take place within a framework in which the Democratic Party redefines its concept of fairness and the Republican Party redefines its concept of the role of government. At present, neither is appropriate for the revolution that technology, globalization and the inclusion of an additional one billion people to the global work force will bring about tomorrow.

Ultimately, a rising tide will float all ships, and both political parties can help bring this about. If they fail to do so, at a minimum the present malaise will turn uglier, and it is even conceivable that another tide will sweep away existing parties. If that were to happen, arguments about growth or fairness will be totally irrelevant.●

STEVEN P. AUSTIN—1996 FIRE SERVICE PERSON OF THE YEAR

● Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, 30 years ago, President Lyndon Johnson stated,

> The American firefighter today must meet the challenge of fires caused by numerous new chemicals, explosives, and combustible fibers, and other dangerous materials. He must be prepared to fight fires in crowded cities and giant buildings, as well as in remote rural communities.

Today, we know that these challenges to the fire services have grown considerably. The greatest example, of course, being the tragedy in Oklahoma City.

That is why today, Mr. President, I am honored to pay tribute to Steven P. Austin, who last night at the National Fire and Emergency Services Dinner, was named Fire Service Person of the Year.

Steve Austin serves as chairman of the National Advisory Committee for the Congressional Fire Services Institute, working countless hours to meet the challenges faced by the fire and emergency services. He works diligently helping those who help us in times of crisis.

Steve Austin may remember President Johnson's words back in 1966, because 3 years prior, Steve Austin began his service as a volunteer firefighter. Today, he continues to respond to emergency calls as a member of the Aetna Hose, Hook and Ladder Company of Newark, DE.

Along with his work as chairman and firefighter, Steve Austin, continues to serve as a fire claims superintendent for the State Farm Fire and Casualty Company, external affairs representative for the International Association of Arson Investigators, chairman of the NFPA Technical Committee on Fire Investigator Professional Qualifications, and as a member of the Delaware State Fire Police. In the past, he has been president of the New Castle County Volunteer Firemen's Association and also president of the Delaware Chapter International Association of Arson Investigators.

During his distinguished career, Steve Austin has received the George H. Parker Distinguished Service Award, the Life Membership Award, and the Presidential Award from the International Association of Arson Investigators.

Steve Austin is committed to meeting the new challenges faced by the fire services. I am confident that as long as there are dedicated people like him, the fire service will continue to serve us with the heroism, bravery and professionalism that we have all come to expect. It is an honor to pay tribute to him today as a great leader, a great Delawarean, and a great friend.●

TRIBUTE TO PAUL D. BARNES

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we are quick to criticize those who work for our Government but rarely recognize the people who have dedicated long careers to making Government work better and more cost effectively for all of us. For that reason, I want to pay tribute today to Paul D. Barnes.

Mr. Barnes is currently the Regional Commissioner for the Social Security Administration's Chicago region. His fine service in Chicago will end in late May, when he assumes his new position as Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Operations in Baltimore, MD. I am confident that Chicago's loss will be Baltimore's gain as Mr. Barnes brings his strong work ethic and demonstrated leadership to his new job.

Paul Barnes has served as Regional Commissioner for the Social Security Administration's Chicago region, which includes all six Midwestern States, since November 1990. As regional commissioner, he has been responsible for providing executive direction and leadership to the region's 7,500 Federal employees and the 2,200 State employees with whom they contract for disability determinations. These employees provide Social Security services as well as administer the Supplemental Security Income Program for the 45 million people who reside in the region.